



MEETING SUMMARY

TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE NORTH BELLEVUE SENIOR COMMUNITY CENTER, BELLEVUE, WA SEPTEMBER 27, 2000 - 1:00 TO 5:00 P.M.

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, welcomed the committee members and reviewed the agenda. No changes were made.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jorgen Bader, acting secretary for the Seattle Community Council Federation, wanted to bring comments, which were made by the Community Council Federation and two other groups to the attention of the Executive Committee and the Trans-Lake Washington Project consultants for due consideration. Understanding that there was no deadline to submit comments in this process, the Federation did a thorough job in creating scoping comments, and submitted them after the August 14, 2000, date for which comments were included in the scoping summary. Not seeing them in the scoping summary, Mr. Bader believed that they would not be considered.

Mr. Bader urged the committee to consider the letters. The content of the letters urges the use of transit, pointing out that the PSRC meetings have indicated that no more freeways in Seattle should be built; land-use decisions and changes to quality of life should be discussed in making transportation decisions.

The Seattle Community Council Federation is a voluntary association of chartered community councils, founded in 1948, which meets once a month. Council members are not restricted by geographic location. There are 20 active council members, and eight inactive council members.

Philip Grega, 1902 Second Ave, Seattle, spoke as a citizen concerned with transportation issues. He suggested using regional parking taxes as a revenue source to fund projects to increase mode choices. He would like to see a focus on transit, establishment of more park and rides, and express lanes.

Paul Demetriades, Council member, City of Medina, suggested that the following early actions should be undertaken immediately:

1. Replace SR 520 bridge guardrails;
2. Create a surface water runoff management system pursuant to ESA and 4(D) regulations;

3. Replace bridge pontoons;
4. Make a seismic upgrade/retrofit of bridge, on the east and west high rises.

James Felch, a Seattle resident, presented a report proposing a submerged floating tunnel. He briefly outlined the cost benefits of the tunnel, as well as other potential benefits, including the possibility of the lake becoming a waterway again.

Project Acceleration

Rob Fellows, Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT), presented a proposition for project schedule acceleration. An accelerated schedule was considered as a request of the July 2000, Executive Committee meeting, as well as a result of Transportation Commission recommendations in the wake of a barge's collision with the SR 520 bridge supports. A value analysis process completed in August 2000, recommended that the schedule be accelerated, aggressive project management be pursued, and funding options be pursued concurrently with alternatives development and the EIS. Rob stressed that the project would maintain all commitments to work with the affected communities.

The benefits of schedule acceleration include:

- Save up to nine months by the time of the ROD;
- Implement faster decision making;
- Reduce cost of the EIS.

Risks include:

- Decision makers may not ready to decide;
- Consultant resources may not be available;
- Stakeholders may feel the process is moving too fast.

Doing the following would shorten the schedule:

1. Shortening the amount of time spent on the first screening;
2. Starting conceptual design concurrently with end of the first screening and beginning of the second screening. This would imply:
 - a. Dramatically narrowing the range of alternatives;
 - b. Decisions being made faster (especially by Executive Committee)
 - c. Detailed focus on neighborhood and mitigation issues
3. Starting preparation of the Final EIS concurrently with release of DEIS.

Rob stated that the project team agrees that this is a better schedule. The team feels not only that it wants to do it quicker, but also better. Environmental stewardship and community needs will not be compromised as a result of acceleration. The availability of funding will be the largest risk to successful acceleration. Partner agencies also have to be approached to see if the review period for the DEIS meets their needs.

Aubrey Davis, Washington Transportation Commission, commended the project team for doing what the public wants without dropping other issues from consideration, and stated that the Executive Committee will need to make the needed project decisions. Comments made by the committee members supported the accelerated schedule, with the following points noted:

- Decisions made should be thoughtful, clear, and well researched.
- The Sound Transit plan to use I-90 for high capacity transit to the eastside has not been changed, and appropriate consideration should be given to that in assumptions for this process.
- Construction coordination should ensure that both the SR 520 and I-90 bridges are not under construction simultaneously.
- Community response in the Points Communities has been both positive and wary.
- Challenges to the process may extend several years, if the deliverables and reports do not meet regulations.
- Public involvement and input under this process will be good, fair, quick and thorough. It may be necessary to push in the communities a bit to remind them how long this process has been underway.
- The push for budgets will be made when necessary, and there is general agreement that this project needs to be funded.
- No matter how much time is devoted to public process- two, five, or ten years – two years later the project will be criticized for not having done enough.
- Schedule acceleration may imply more, longer meetings. The committees will need to digest the work done by the consultants.
- Regional decisions will be made at the second level screening, and these are fundamental to the acceleration. These decisions may not have the level of detail to which WSDOT and the participating agencies are accustomed. The decisions, scheduled for May 2001, will therefore be difficult.
- The Federal Transit Administration is concerned that the schedule leaves no room for slippage, and a plan should be in place to deal with anticipated slowdowns.

There was consensus that schedule acceleration should be pursued, with the caveats noted. No contrary positions were taken.

Results of Scoping Input

Lorie Parker briefed the committee on the results of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping process. The scoping report included comments received by August 14, 2000. She reiterated that scoping would continue throughout the process, as specified in NEPA rules.

Comments included calls for more highways, a new lake crossing, and tunnels; concerns were expressed about environmental and community issues. The scoping report will be sent out to all who commented, and will be available at Sound Transit and the WSDOT Office of Urban Mobility.

Rosemarie Ives, City of Redmond, noted that a campaign to educate the public on proper uses of the interstate and limited access highways might be conducted.

Screening Process and Criteria

Lorie Parker stated that approval for the first level screening criteria is being sought today, as they have been agreed upon by the Technical Committee. The second level screening criteria as presented reflect the comments of the Technical Committee, but will be reviewed again by that committee before presentation to the Executive Committee for approval. Lorie clarified that the second level screening will occur in two parts. The modal alternatives will be looked at individually first. The best of these will then be combined in multi-modal alternatives.

Lorie reviewed the criteria for both the first level and second level screenings. Comments included:

- Connie Marshall, City of Bellevue, doesn't want to bias the assumption about which bridge HCT will ultimately be on. The I-90 decision is being directed back to the Trans-Lake Executive Committee, even though the I-405 study is presuming HCT on I-90.
- Dan Becker, City of Medina, stated that costs should not even be given if they only represent gross estimates.
- There was concern that highly effective ratings will supercede poor environmental ratings.
- A concern was expressed that land use and TDM/TSM solutions may be the most cost effective, environmentally responsible, and will address congestion, but will be politically impractical. A criterion to check the reality of application should also be considered. An analysis might also be done to more quickly look at the composite systems. Independent consideration as modal alternatives might indicate wrong choices.

There was some discussion about how TDM/TSM alternatives would be built into final decisions on a build option. John Okamoto, WSDOT, offered that the decision on the size of the TDM/TSM/land use package should be made early in the second level screening. Jeff Peacock stated that a fundamental question would be whether a TDM/TSM/land use option could influence an ultimate decision on an option.

There was further discussion on including cost information in the first level screening, even though it is not being recommended for consideration as a criterion. Dan Becker objected strongly to including any cost information. Jeff Peacock assured the committee that both of the other committees discussed cost at length, and both recommended presenting information, but not basing evaluation on cost.

The Executive Committee accepted the first level screening criteria as presented by the Technical Committee.

Community Design Process

Jeff Peacock presented information about how the community design workshops would be carried out. He noted that the workshops are not replacing broader public outreach efforts.

The community design workshops will be a series of three workshops, each conducted in four different geographical regions along the SR 520 corridor. The areas slated are the Montlake, Portage Bay-Roanoke, Bellevue I-405 area, and Redmond. All-day sessions with the participants will then be opened up for public review and discussion in the evening. The participants should be objective, community-based people, who will be able to attend all the sessions.

The first workshop will focus on the values of the community, and what would constitute success for the project. The second workshop will work through what is happening with the alternatives, and the third will allow the neighborhoods to give input to the final second level screening. Comments on the process included the following:

- Dan Becker suggested opening with a broader community workshop, then limiting it to the workshop participants.
- Number of participants is flexible, but the consultants are thinking 15-20 in each workshop.
- The workshop schedule fits with critical milestones in the second level screening, and will not likely be very flexible without upsetting the project schedule.
- Will the workshops be only concerned with specific geographic areas?

SR 520 Update

John Okamoto, WSDOT, gave an update on the repairs and early actions for the SR 520 bridge, including guideroller replacement, concrete repair to the support columns damaged in the barge collision, effects of ramp metering on the westbound on-ramps on the eastside, and plans to work with Montlake to make ramp metering more efficient. Jeanne Berry, Town of Yarrow Point, stated that they were pleased with the results of the metering at 84th St.

Advisory and Technical Steering Committee Update

Pat Serie gave a quick update on the work and schedule for the Advisory and Technical Steering Committees.

There were no other comments or questions.

MEETING HANDOUTS

1. Agenda
2. EIS Schedule Acceleration Options – Presentation
3. Schedule Acceleration Recommendations - Chart
4. Summary of Scoping Comments – Presentation
5. Alternatives Analysis- Draft Screening Process and Criteria, Tech Memo, September 20, 2000
6. Sample First level screening worksheet
7. Draft Community Design Workshop Schedule
8. Meeting Schedule
9. Draft 2001 Project committee schedule

Supplemental

1. EIS Scoping Summary Report
2. Proposed Schedule Acceleration Options –ST/WSDOT Value analysis results
3. Value analysis report

MEETING ATTENDEES

Committee Members

Present	Name		Organization
X	Becker	Daniel	City of Medina
X	Berry	Jeanne	Town of Yarrow Point
X	Cairns	Bryan	City of Mercer Island
	Conlin	Richard	City of Seattle
X	Crawford	Jack	Sound Transit Board
X	Davis	Aubrey	Washington Transportation Commission
X	Earling	Dave	Sound Transit Board
X	Edwards	Bob	Puget Sound Regional Council
	Fong	Gene	Federal Highway Administration
X	Ganz	Nona	City of Kirkland
	Gehrke	Linda	Federal Transit Administration
	Grigsby	Daryl	City of Seattle
	Horn	Jim	Washington State Senate
X	Ives	Rosemarie	City of Redmond
	Jacobsen	Ken	Washington State Senate

X	Marshall	Connie	City of Bellevue
X	Martin	George	City of Clyde Hill
	McConkey	Fred	Town of Hunts Point
	McIver	Richard	City of Seattle
X	McKenna	Rob	King County Council
	Murray	Ed	WA State House of Representatives
X	Noble	Phil	City of Bellevue
X	Okamoto	John	WSDOT - NW Region
	Pflug	Cheryl	WA State House of Representatives
X	Sullivan	Cynthia	King County Council
X	Taniguchi	Harold	King County Department of Transportation
X	Wills	Heidi	City of Seattle

Committee Alternates

Present	Name	Organization
	Asher David	City of Kirkland
	Bowman Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
X	Drais Dan	FTA
X	Carpenter Trish	Town of Hunts Point
	Creighton Mike	City of Bellevue
X	Demitriades Paul	City of Medina
	Dye Dave	WSDOT - NW Region
	Fimia Maggi	Puget Sound Regional Council / King County Council
	Hague Jane	King County Council
X	Hughes Gary	Federal Highway Administration
	Jahncke El	City of Mercer Island
	Kargianis George	Washington Transportation Commission
	Paine Thomas	City of Redmond
	Rourke Philip	City of Clyde Hill
	Rutledge Steve	City of Yarrow Point
X	Switaj Ed	City of Seattle
	White Bob	Sound Transit

Other attendees

Philip Grega, Seattle
 Jorgen Bader, Seattle Community Council Federation
 James Felch, Seattle
 Dave Elliot, Bellevue Transportation Commission
 Doug Pullen, Kemper Development
 Kingsley Joneson, Portage Bay – Roanoke Community Club
 Nancy Fairchild, Mercer Island
 Clarissa Easton, Montlake Community Club
 Chris Johnsesons, King County Council

Project Team

Rob Fellows, WSDOT
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
John Perlic, Parametrix
Daryl Wendle, Parametrix
Paul Hezel, EnviroIssues
Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues

[PJH]